

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, no claim has been amended, added or cancelled. Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103:

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishna (US 6,477,646) in view of Calderon (U.S. Pub. No. 20030225991). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claim 13 recites at least the following features:

if a fixed width that is the width of a data packet processed inside a system is a multiple of a variable width that is a width of an arbitrary data packet input from the outside of the system, sequentially receiving a number of variable width first data packets, the number of which being the same as that of a combination value, that is obtained by dividing the fixed width by the variable width

Krishna and Calderon, taken separately or in combination, do not suggest or disclose, at least, all of the above-recited features.

Krishna is directed to a method for cryptography acceleration that converts a "random-length IP packet" into "a plurality of fixed size cells" (col. 5, lines 12-17). Thus, in Krishna, a variable width packet is divided into a plurality of smaller fixed width cells. In other words, Krishna describes variable width packets having a width that is a multiple of a width of the fixed width cells (see Krishna FIG. 2 and col. 4, lines 58-59). Accordingly, Krishna is directed to a method that is opposite of and completely inconsistent with the above-claimed features.

Calderon is directed to a method for increasing memory access efficiency by buffering packets using on-chip memories (par. [0023]). Calderon does not distinguish between variable width data packets input from outside a system and fixed width data packets processed inside a system. In fact, Calderon does not discuss fixed width data packets at all, other than to acknowledge that ATM networks typically use packets of a fixed length (paragraph [0003]). Consequently, Calderon does not suggest or disclose all of the above-claimed features.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 13 patentably distinguishes over the cited references, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by each of the independent claims 1 and 7, with potentially differing scope and breadth, are not taught or disclosed by the references, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1 and 7 also allowed.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18, which variously depend from independent claims 1, 7, and 13, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 7, and 13, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Independent claim 1 recites at least the following features:

a variable width-fixed width cipher data packet conversion unit which, if a fixed width is a width of a cipher data packet to be processed in a deciphering process and is a multiple of a variable width, which is a width of an arbitrary cipher data packet input by an arbitrary interface module, the variable width-fixed width cipher data packet conversion unit sequentially receives a number of variable width cipher data packets, the number of which being the same as that of a combination value, which is obtained by dividing the fixed width by the variable width, combines the number of sequentially input variable width cipher data packets received to generate a fixed width cipher data packet and outputs the fixed width cipher data packet

Krishna and Calderon, taken separately or in combination, do not suggest or disclose, at least, all of the above-recited features.

The Office Action acknowledges on page 2, item 4 that "Krishna does not explicitly disclose the number of which being the same as that of a combination value, which is obtained by dividing the fixed width by the variable width, combines the number of sequentially input variable width cipher data packets received to generate a fixed width cipher data packet and outputs the fixed width cipher data packet."

However, the Office Action proposes to modify Krishna with Calderon, and asserts that Calderon illustrates and describes combining small variable length packets into a fixed size packet..." at (FIG. 7 and paragraph [0036]).

Calderon generically describes a method for increasing memory access efficiency for packet data applications (par. [0023]). However, Calderon is not directed to ciphering techniques and does not discuss cipher data packets at all, let alone "cipher data packets to be processed in a deciphering system." Further, Calderon does not suggest or disclose

“sequentially input variable width cipher data packets received to generate a fixed width cipher data packet.”

Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by independent claim 7, with potentially differing scope and breadth, are not taught or disclosed by the references, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 7 also allowed.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-6, and 8-12, which variously depend from independent claims 1 and 7, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 7, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Dependent claim 11 recites at least the following features:

storing the fixed width cipher data packet, converting the stored fixed width cipher data packet into deciphering width cipher data; deciphering the converted deciphering width cipher data to generate a deciphering width data; converting the deciphering width data into a fixed width data packet; and storing the converted fixed width data packet.

Krishna and Calderon, taken separately or in combination, do not suggest or disclose, at least, all of the above-recited features.

The Office Action fails to specifically set forth if and where the above-claimed features are disclosed in either Krishna or Calderon. If the above rejection is to be maintained, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner provide a specific paragraph number and figure reference supporting the rejection. Applicants request the same support for rejected dependent claims 14-18.

No Motivation to Combine

Applicants submit that the Office Action also fails to set forth a particular explanation as to why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine or modify Krishna in view of Calderon. In *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 127 SCt 1727, 167 LE2d 705 (U.S. 2007), the U.S. Supreme Court held that in determining obviousness, one “must ask whether the improvement is more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions” slip op. 13, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. Furthermore, it is necessary “to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed” slip op. 14, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

In rejecting claims 1-18, the only reason given for combining Krishna and Calderon was "because it increases memory access efficiency for packet applications." (Office Action, pages 3, item 4 last sentence). Applicants submit that these reasons are insufficient to answer the question posed by *KSR v. Teleflex*, i.e., whether these claims recite a predictable use of established functions of the devices disclosed in Krishna and Calderon.

As discussed above, Krishna is directed to a method for cryptography acceleration and Calderon is directed to a method for increasing memory access efficiency for generic packet data applications. The Office Action fails to cite anything suggesting that one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to use the generic packet data techniques of Calderon for the cryptographic applications discussed in Krishna. In short, there is nothing in the prior art to make predictable the combination of Krishna and Calderon in the manner used in rejecting the claims. It is submitted that only the template provided by the claims themselves made the combination of these references seem obvious to the Examiner.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 13, 2007

By: 

David J. Cutitta
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501